

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace Figures 2, 6, 9, 13, 22A, 22B, 23 and 24A through 24F, as shown in the accompanying Letter Transmitting Replacement Drawings.

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 9, 2005. Claims 2 to 6, 8 and 9 are in the application, of which Claims 6 and 9 are independent. Claims 1 and 7 have been cancelled with Claims 6 and 9 being amended to independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Applicant has amended the drawings to clarify the elements labeled 111, 112, 55, 56, 57 and 601 to 611. In addition, Applicant has amended Figures 22A, 22B, 23 and 24A to 24F and corresponding portions of the Specification to more clearly show the arrangement of the illustrated prior art measurement apparatus. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

An objection was also lodged against the drawings based on the language of Claim 7. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to include the language of Claim 7 (see below). In making this amendment, the "amplifier" of Claim 7 has been changed to "amplifiers," such that the as-filed drawings are believed to reflect the language of the claims.

Claims 3, 6 and 9, which were objected to over informalities, have been amended to correct the informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.


Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 6 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In keeping with this indication of allowable subject matter, Applicant has amended each of Claims 6 and 9 into independent form, and consequently these claims are seen to be in condition for allowance.

The Office Action entered rejections of Claims 1 to 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,769,594 (Darius), Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Darius in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,457 (Nakayama), Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Darius in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,319,977 (Quate), Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Darius in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,198 (Susuki) and U.S. Patent No. 6,188,283 (Cripe), and Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Darius in view of Susuki and Cripe and further in view of Quate. The foregoing actions have been taken without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding correctness of the rejections, but rather strictly to obtain an earlier allowance and to expedite issuance. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejections.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200